



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/600,832	07/21/2000	ANDREAS GIEFER	67526	2069

23872 7590 07/16/2002

MCGLEW & TUTTLE, PC
SCARBOROUGH STATION
SCARBOROUGH, NY 10510

EXAMINER

LUONG, VINH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3682

12

DATE MAILED: 07/16/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Interview Summary

Application No.
09/600,832

Applicant(s)
GIEFER

Examiner
Luong

Art Unit
3682



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Luong (3) _____
(2) Theobald Dengler (4) _____

Date of Interview 7/15/02

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: 36

Identification of prior art discussed:

Andronis (German Publication No. DE 197 28 548 A1)

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Applicant contended that Andronis' louver guide 14, 15, 38-46 is not movably connected to the cover plate 2 as claimed in claim 36. The examiner respectfully disagreed with that contention because Andronis' Fig. 4 shows that when the lever 6, 16 is moved, the elements 14 and 15 are moved therewith, consequently, the other elements 39-42 are also moved therewith. Applicant contended that the translation describes that the elements 39-42 are integral with the cover 2. The examiner contended that: (a) the translation apparently does not specify that the cover 2 is fixed; and (b) applicant's contention is relied on the intended use statement or the mode of operation of the device, thus, it is not persuasive since applicant's claims are not process of using claims.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

LUONG
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 3682

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required